UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,543	07/09/2001	Chin-woo Yoo	YPLA0009	7112

7590	08/23/2004

J.C. PATENTS INC.
Suite 250
4 Venture
Irvine, CA 92618

EXAMINER
STRANGE, AARON N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/901,543	YOO, CHIN-WOO
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Aaron Strange	2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on. *08 January 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 July 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2.   Claims 3,9,17, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

3.   With regard to claims 3 and 17, the specification fails to disclose how the primary document creates, deletes, and switches the secondary web documents. Furthermore, a document does not have the capability to perform such operations. Some sort of software or hardware must be present to perform operations such as creating, deleting, and switching. For the purpose of applying prior art, it has been interpreted that a software module performs these operations.

4.   With regard to claims 9 and 23, the specification fails to provide support for the claim limitation "documents are stored in association with" in line 2 of each claim. The specification states that the "documents may be stored in objects such as". Storing in association with an object and storing in an object are distinct operations.

5.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6.   Claims 7-9,15-29,34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7.   Claim 7 recites the limitation "the secondary web documents that indicate the result of a search" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

8.   Claims 8,15,34 and 35 recite the limitation "the web page" in line 1 of each claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

9.   Regarding claims 9 and 23, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

10.   All claims not individually rejected are rejected by virtue of their dependency from the above claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

11.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

12.   Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed

invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

13.   With regard to claim 32, the "web browser" claimed is a software program per se,

and since it not tangibly embodied on a computer readable medium, it is merely a

manipulation of abstract ideas.

14.   With regard to claim 33, the "web page" claimed appears to be a program per se.

Based on the specification, the functionality claimed in contained within the web page,

making it a program. Since it is not tangibly embodied on a computer readable medium,

it is merely a manipulation of abstract ideas.

15.   To expedite a complete examination of the instant application, the claims

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth

below in anticipation of Applicant amending these claims to place them within the four

statutory categories of invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

16.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed
publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

17.   Claims 1-5,8-19, and 22-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being

anticipated by Bertram et al. (US 6,049,812).

18.   With regard to claims 1,15,30, and 32, Bertram et al. (Bertram, hereafter)

discloses a method for web document processing using a multi-browsing function for

incorporating and browsing a plurality of web documents at a terminal connected to a

server through a network, the method comprising the steps of: obtaining web

documents including at least a primary document (Logon and load first URL) (Col 10,

Lines 39-42); obtaining one or more secondary web documents from the primary

document (Select hypertext link and load secondary document) (Col 11, Lines 14-35);

displaying document selectors associated with the secondary web documents on a

screen of the terminal (Insert document into the working list) (Col 29-35 and Col 7, Lines

6-15); and upon selecting one of the document selectors, displaying a secondary web

document corresponding to a selected document selector on the screen of the terminal

(Col 11, Lines 36-48 and Col 11, Lines 56-61). Storing data of the secondary web

documents in corresponding predetermined storing portions is inherent in the system

disclosed by Bertram. The computer must read the document from a predetermined

storage location in order for it to be displayed when selected. Therefore, this limitation is

present, despite the lack of a specific reference to it.

19.   With regard to claims 2 and 16, Bertram further discloses that the primary

document is indicated by a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) (Col 10, Lines 39-42).

20.   With regard to claims 3 and 17, Bertram further discloses that the primary

document creates, deletes, and switches the secondary web documents (Browser

module creates new documents, deletes old ones, and brings the current documents

into view) (Col 11, Line 56 to Col 12, Line 20).

21.   With regard to claims 4 and 18, Bertram further discloses deleting data of a

previous secondary web document stored in a storing portion (Col 11, Line 63 to Col 2,

Line 1), recording the content of a new secondary web document on the storing portion

(Col 11, Lines 58-61), and displaying the new secondary web document on the screen

when another new secondary web document is obtained through a link on the

secondary web document displayed on the screen of the terminal (Col 11, Line 49 to

Col 12, Line 20).

22.   With regard to claims 5 and 19, Bertram further discloses that the secondary web

documents are generated by specifying URLS of web sites containing the secondary

web documents (User types in a requested URL and it is added to the working list) (Col

11, Lines 6-20).

23.   With regard to claims 8 and 22, Bertram further discloses that the web page of

the server displayed on the screen of the terminal includes at least one of a separate

location/URL input area and a search term input area and a virtual browser window

where the secondary web documents are superimposed in layers (Web documents are

displayed in layers) (Col 7, Lines 16-23 and Fig 4).

24.   With regard to claims 9 and 23, Bertram further discloses that the plurality of

secondary web documents are stored in association with objects such as frame, inline

frame (iframe), layer, division, and span, and if a select event for the objects occurs, a

selected object is displayed on the virtual browser window (When a item is selected

from the working list it is displayed in the browser) (Col 11, Lines 39-42 and 58-61).

25.   With regard to claims 10 and 24, Bertram further discloses that the secondary

web documents includes two types of documents: documents predesignated and

provided to the user (Documents previously saved in the working list) (Col 10, Lines 39-

42) and documents designated by the user during browsing (Documents entered

manually or chosen via hyperlink) (Col 11, Lines 6-35).

26.   With regard to claims 11 and 25, Bertram further discloses that the secondary

web documents predesignated and provided to the user are designated by the server

and/or the User (User has previously saved the documents) (Col 10, Lines 39-42).

27.   With regard to claims 12 and 26, Bertram further discloses that the secondary

web documents designated by the user during browsing are designated by entering

Internet Protocol (IP) addresses or domain names or clicking on a hypertext linked to a

web document (Documents are entered manually by entering a URL or chosen via

hyperlink) (Col 11, Lines 6-35), or they are designated according to an input result

submitted through an input form contained in a predetermined web document.

28.   With regard to claims 13 and 29, as discussed regarding claim 1, further

discloses that data of the plurality of secondary web documents are automatically stored

in the storing portions during web browsing without extra manipulation by the user. The

computer must read the document from a predetermined storage location in order for it

to be displayed when selected. Since the documents are automatically retrieved in

response to a hyperlink selection or entered URL, no further manipulation is required.

Therefore, this limitation is present, despite the lack of a specific reference to it.

29.   With regard to claims 14 and 27, Bertram further discloses that the web

document processing method is implemented with a script and/or general purpose

program to be executed on the terminal (Col 6, Lines 40-50).

30.   With regard to claim 28, Bertram further discloses that the terminal is a PC-based

client-server system, a web TV, a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA), or a web phone

(Terminal is a client ins a client/server arrangement) (Col 6, Lines 3-7).

31.   With regard to claim 31, Bertram discloses a method for web document

processing for performing web browsing at a terminal for Internet communications, the

method comprising the steps of: opening and loading a plurality of web documents

together (Col 10, Lines 39-58); loading the plurality of web documents into different

objects such as layers or frames (Fig 4); upon selecting one of the plurality of web

documents, displaying a selected web document on a multi-browser window while

making a current layer invisible from the window (Col 11, Lines 58-61); upon entering a

URL into a location window of the multi-browser window, changing a document of a

current object displayed on the multi-browser window to a document of a location

identified by the input URL (Col 11, Lines 6-20); and affecting the document of the

current object displayed on the multi-browser window when clicking on forward, back,

and reload buttons (Forward and back buttons move user through history list) (Col 9,

Line 64 to Col 10, Line 25 and Fig 4).

32.   With regard to claim 33, Bertram discloses providing a web-browsing function to

a user accessing a web page through a terminal capable of Internet communications,

wherein the web page comprises a document selecting portion for displaying a plurality

of web documents on a web browser at once so that a user can select one of the

plurality of web documents (Col 7, Lines 6-15 and Col 10, Lines 39-58), and wherein the

web page comprises a multi-browser window for displaying an object of the selected

web document while clearing a previous web document (Col 11, Lines 58-61).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

33.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

34.   Claims 6,7,20,21,34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bertram et al. (US 6,049,812) in view of NetCaptor.

35.   The Office would like to inform Applicant that the collection of references from

NetCaptor, beginning with the document titled "NetCaptor 1999", while located in a

plurality of separate files, have been treated as a single reference, and numbered by the

Examiner. All of the references are parts of the same website, retrieved from the

Internet Archive Wayback Machine, dating from 10/13/1999 to 11/16/1999, and relating

to the same subject matter. The reference is very much like multiple chapters in a book,

and have accordingly been treated a single reference in this Office action.

36.   With regard to claims 6,7,20, and 21, while the system disclosed by Bertram

shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to

disclose that the secondary web documents are generated by using a plurality of results

processed based on data input or selected by a user or that the secondary web

documents indicate the result of a search made by a plurality of search engines.

NetCaptor discloses a similar multi-browser which displays multiple documents

designated by tabs in the browser interface (Page 1). NetCaptor further teaches

searching a plurality of search engines simultaneously, wherein each engine is

searched on a new tab. This would be an advantageous addition to the system

disclosed by Bertram since it would have allowed the user to search multiple engines

simultaneously and receive each set of results on a separate tab, making it much faster

to find desired information.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to allow the user to search multiple search engines based

on a search term input by the user, and have the secondary documents indicate the

results of the multi-engine search. This would make it much faster to search for

information since multiple engines could be searched simultaneously and the results for

each engine separately displayed.

37.   With regard to claims 34 and 35, Bertram further discloses that the web page of

the server displayed on the screen of the terminal includes at least one of a separate

location/URL input area and a search term input area and a virtual browser window

where the secondary web documents are superimposed in layers (Web documents are

displayed in layers) (Col 7, Lines 16-23 and Fig 4).

Conclusion

38.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

39.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Strange whose telephone number is 703-305-8878. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

     If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on 703-305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

     Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ANS 8/16/2004

Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner